

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Examiner's attention to the present application is noted with appreciation.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as indefinite.

Corrective amendments have been made. Applicants thank the Examiner for the opportunity to clarify the claims.

Claims 6 and 15 have been amended to correct typographical errors

In addition, to more completely claim the invention, new claims 17 and 18 have been added. Support for these claims can be found in the specification on page 13, lines 22-27.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beyer et al., either solely or in view of Jeantette et al., or in view of Harwell et al., and further in view of Jeantette et al. Submitted herewith is a Rule 131 Declaration of inventor David M. Keicher noting that the present invention was conceived prior to the foreign application priority date of Beyer et al. In addition, because the present application as a divisional claims priority to January 22, 1998, which is the filing date of parent U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/010,673 (now issued as U.S. Patent No. 5,993,554), the Examiner's citing of Harwell et al. (filed May 12, 1998) as prior art is improper. All such rejections are thus traversed.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jeantette et al. Such rejection is respectfully traversed. It may be obvious to use a single higher power laser viewing the teachings of Jeantette et al. However, this does not give sufficient control over the manufacture of areas with fine features, and degrades the material properties due to the large amount of heat deposited. It would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use multiple laser beams, not only because of the complexity of the resulting device but also because of the difficulty of controlling deposition features and anticipated degradation of material properties. Therefore the use of multiple beams was not contemplated by or suggested in the art. However, the present invention discloses the means necessary to control multiple beams, which is not a duplication of parts, so the

creation of both fine and coarse features is enhanced, and the quality of material properties is maintained, or even enhanced.

Note that Jeantette et al. is the equivalent of the admitted prior art noted at the top of page 2 of the present specification, and that two U.S. patents have issued in view of this art, namely parent U.S. Patent No. 5,993,554 and its daughter U.S. Patent No. 6,268,584.


Also being filed herewith is a Petition for Extension of Time to October 21, 2003, with the appropriate fee. Authorization is given to charge payment of any additional fees required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Acct. 13-4213. A duplicate of this paper is enclosed for accounting purposes.

In view of the above amendments and remarks it is respectfully submitted that all grounds of rejection and objection have been avoided and/or traversed. It is believed that the case is now in condition for allowance and same is respectfully requested.

If any issues remain, or if the Examiner believes that prosecution of this application might be expedited by discussion of the issues, the Examiner is cordially invited to telephone the undersigned attorney for Applicant at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

PEACOCK, MYERS & ADAMS, P.C.



By: _____

Rod D. Baker
Reg. No. 35,434
Direct Dial: (505) 998-1502

Attorney for Applicant
P.O. Box 26927
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87125-6927
Phone: (505) 998-1500

PATENT Ser. N . 09/841,871

Fax: (505) 243-2542

Date: October 21, 2003

Customer No. 005179

P:\AMDS\Optomec\871_AMD2.doc